Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/715,730	FATTMAN, GEORGE F.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ginger T. Chapman	3761
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Ginger T. Chapman</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. Stuart Krieger.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 23 September 2009	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 103(a).		
Claims discussed: 1, 10, 16-18		
Prior art documents discussed: Celento (US 4,775,374); Lin (US 5,580,915); Doyle (US 4,551,490); Hahn (US 5,983,298).		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
/Ginger T Chapman/ Examiner, Art Unit 3761	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/715,730

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During a telephone call with Applicant's representative, it was noted that the prior art of record discloses open mesh and polyurethane foam substrates but does not teach closed cell foam substrates, or specific particular applications of polysiloxane adhesives in the context of ostomy devices; thickness of adhesive interface layers and coat weights were also discussed, as supported by the instant Specification at pages 13 and 16-17 along with an examiners' amendment to the claims with respect to structural features not found in the prior art.